

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,382	09/23/2003	Akira Ishii	117231	1934
25944 7590 05/15/2007 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC			EXAMINER	
P.O. BOX 1992	28		VO, QUANG N	
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/15/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/667,382	ISHII, AKIRA			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Quang N. Vo	2625			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period and the failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUN 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MC c, cause the application to become A	ICATION. I reply be timely filed INTHS from the mailing date of this communication. ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status	•				
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 S	eptember 2003.				
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☑ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.				
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims	•				
 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrays 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers	•				
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomposed and applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	epted or b) objected to drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawin	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in rity documents have bee u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/7/03;11/20/03;6/19/06.	Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date. Informal Patent Application			

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-10, 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kitagawa et al. (Kitagawa) (US Patent 5055923).

With regard to claim 1, Kitagawa discloses an image forming apparatus for digitally reproducing a color image using a screen set consisting of a halftone screen for each color, wherein a first-color halftone screen and a second-color halftone screen in said screen set satisfy a relationship that first vectors (column 1, lines 44-57), each being either one of two screen vectors in a spatial frequency domain defined by basis vectors in two directions of a halftone dot pattern in the first-color or second-color halftone screen, are parallel to each other (column 2, lines 15-46), and second vectors, each being the other one of the two screen vectors, are not parallel to each other (column 7, lines 54-57).

With regard to claim 2, Kitagawa discloses wherein said first-color halftone screen and said second-color halftone screen further satisfy a relationship that said first vectors are equal in magnitude (column 5, lines 5-20).

With regard to claim 3, Kitagawa discloses wherein at least one of said first-color and second-color halftone screens is a non-orthogonal screen (column 2, lines 61-63).

Art Unit: 2625

With regard to claim 4, Kitagawa discloses wherein a third-color halftone screen and a fourth-color halftone screen satisfy a relationship that second vectors, each being either one of two screen vectors in a spatial frequency domain defined by basis vectors in two directions of a halftone dot pattern in the third-color or fourth-color halftone screen, are parallel to each other as well as equal in magnitude, and first vectors, each being the other one of the two screen vectors, are not parallel to each other (column 4, lines 35-46 and figures 1A-1D).

With regard to claim 5, Kitagawa discloses wherein said first vector of said first-color halftone screen, said first vector of said third-color halftone screen, and said second vector of said second-color halftone screen form an closed triangle, and said second vector of said first-color halftone screen, said first vector of said fourth-color halftone screen, and said second vector of said third-color halftone screen form an closed triangle (column 4, lines 35-46 and figures 1A-1D).

With regard to claim 6, Kitagawa discloses wherein said first vector of said first-color halftone screen, said first vector of said third-color halftone screen, and said second vector of said second-color halftone screen form an closed triangle, and said second vector of said first-color halftone screen, said first vector of said fourth-color halftone screen, and said second vector of said third-color halftone screen form an closed triangle (column 4, lines 35-46 and figures 1A-1C).

With regard to claim 7, Kitagawa discloses wherein said second vector of said first-color halftone screen matches either one of two screen vectors of a third-color halftone screen in said screen set (figures 1A and 1C).

Art Unit: 2625

With regard to claim 8, Kitagawa discloses wherein a secondary spectrum represented by the sum or the difference of the two screen vectors of said first-color halftone screen matches either one of two screen vectors of a fourth-color halftone screen in said screen set (column 4, lines 35-46 and figures 1A and 1D).

With regard to claim 9, Kitagawa discloses wherein said screen set comprises four color halftone screens, and the four color halftone screens have a relationship that two closed triangles can be formed using two screen vectors of each of the four color halftone screens, without a remainder (column 4, lines 35-46 and figures 1A-1D).

With regard to claim 10, Kitagawa discloses wherein in a case where directions of halftone dot arrangement match between said first-color and second-color halftone screens, halftone dot intervals in the matched direction of the first-color halftone screen differ from the halftone dot intervals in the matched direction of the second-color halftone screen (column 7, lines 54-65 and figure 3D (dm3 =/ dc3 =/ dk3)).

With regard to claim 13, Kitagawa discloses an image forming method for digitally reproducing a color image, comprising the steps of: generating halftone images from input color images using a screen set consisting of multiple color halftone screens, wherein a first-color halftone screen and a second-color halftone screen in said screen set satisfy a relationship that first vectors (column 1, lines 44-57), each being either one of two screen vectors in a spatial frequency domain defined by basis vectors in two directions of a halftone pattern of the first-color or second-color halftone screen, are parallel to each other, and second vectors, each being the other one of the two screen

Art Unit: 2625

vectors, are not parallel to each other, and reproducing said input color images by combining said halftone images (column 2, lines 15-26, column 7, lines 54-57).

With regard to claim 14, Kitagawa discloses wherein said first-color halftone screen and said second-color halftone screen further satisfy a relationship that said first vectors are equal in magnitude (column 5, lines 5-20).

With regard to claim 15, Kitagawa discloses wherein at least one of said first-color and second-color halftone screens is a non-orthogonal screen (column 2, lines 61-63).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11, 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kitagawa as applied to claims 1-10, 13-15 above, and further in view of Delabastita (US Patent 5155599).

With regard to claim 11, Kitagawa differs from claim 11, in that he does not teach said screen set comprises four color halftone screens, and among a total of 8 primary spatial frequency spectra each corresponding to one of the screen vectors for each color and a total of 8 secondary spatial frequency spectra each corresponding to the sum or the difference of the screen vectors for the same color, the number of different

Art Unit: 2625

spatial frequency spectra contained in a band of from the minimum frequency to the maximum frequency of said 8 primary spatial frequency spectra is less than 8.

Delabastita discloses screen set comprises four color halftone screens, and among a total of 8 primary spatial frequency spectra each corresponding to one of the screen vectors for each color and a total of 8 secondary spatial frequency spectra each corresponding to the sum or the difference of the screen vectors for the same color, the number of different spatial frequency spectra contained in a band of from the minimum frequency to the maximum frequency of said 8 primary spatial frequency spectra is less than 8 (column 7, lines 28-40).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kitagawa to include screen set comprises four color halftone screens, and among a total of 8 primary spatial frequency spectra each corresponding to one of the screen vectors for each color and a total of 8 secondary spatial frequency spectra each corresponding to the sum or the difference of the screen vectors for the same color, the number of different spatial frequency spectra contained in a band of from the minimum frequency to the maximum frequency of said 8 primary spatial frequency spectra is less than 8 as taught by Delabastita. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Kitagawa by the teaching of Delabastita to provide a screening system that eliminates second order Moire (column 7, lines 14-15).

With regard to claim 12, the subject matter is similar to claim 11. Therefore, the rejection on claim 12 is the same as the rejection on claim 11.

Art Unit: 2625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quang N. Vo whose telephone number is 5712701121. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-5:00PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Twyler M. Lamb can be reached on 5712727406. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Cluanger

Quang N. Vo 5/2/07 **Patent Examiner**

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Page 7